

COPY

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The claims have been amended by rewriting claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 17, 20 and 29 without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 17-21 were rejected as anticipated by the Yokota reference of record.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 11-16 and 29 were rejected as anticipated by the Yokota (US 5,712,582) in view of Lee (US 5,901,190).

Applicants respectfully traverse in part and amend in part. As to independent claims 1, 11, 17 and 29, the input 24 into Applicant's delay line 10 does not change based on the reconfiguration. Yokota's input to delay line (120), on the other hand, does change in response to the reconfiguration because of the feedback path, as seen in FIG. 1. Applicants' input 24 to delay line 10 and data out 42 are not tied together (no feedback) and are thus structurally distinguishable from the Yokota reference.

Applicants have also amended the independent claims to recite that the configurable processing array generates a periodic output in response to each program command. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is found on page, 9, lines 9-17. None of the cited references taken individually or combined teach this claimed aspect of the invention. Dependent claims 3, 12 and 20 have also been amended to include that the control processor comprises one of: data information logic in conjunction with an arithmetic logic unit (ALU), data formatting logic in conjunction with a multiplexer, and multiplexer in conjunction with an ALU. Support for this amendment is found in FIGs. 3, 4 and 5 along with the accompanying text found on page 7, lines 29-30 through page 9, line 17. Neither Yokota nor Lee taken individually or combined teach this claimed aspect of the invention. The Examiner equates element (160) of Yokota to a control processor. However, Yokota's element (160) is a decoder. The claims, as amended, further distinguish Applicants' control processor and are thus believed to be in condition for allowance. Neither reference taken individually or

COPY

combined teaches that which is claimed by Applicants' invention. The remaining claims are dependent claims providing further limitations to what are believed to be allowable claims and hence are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-10 and 17-21 and claims 5, 11-16 and 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The undersigned additionally notes that many other distinctions exist between the cited art and the claims. However, in view of the clear distinctions pointed out above, further discussion is believed to be unnecessary at this time. Failure to address each point raised in the Office Action should accordingly not be viewed as accession to the Examiner's position or an admission of any sort.

No amendment made herein was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim unless an argument has been made herein that such amendment has been made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In view of this communication, all claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested at an early date. If further matters remain to be resolved, the undersigned respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview. The undersigned can be reached at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

May 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com